

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that cascading of the batteries allows weak batteries in two wireless mobile devices to power one of the devices. This was recited in the original claims, and therefore does not raise **new issues**, although the rejection appears to be based on charging of a battery in one wireless device.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Rejection of Claims 1-2 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent No. 6,501,246 (You)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Hong publication nor the You patent fail to disclose or suggest **cascading** (connecting together) the **batteries** of multiple wireless communication devices, as claimed, so that the cascaded batteries in each of the first and second wireless devices can jointly (“**together**”) be used to power one of the communication devices during an emergency or critical situation. The Hong publication discloses connection of two wireless devices (phone 100 and device 300 shown in Fig. 6, which may also be a phone) **so that one device powers the other**, but not cascading batteries so that the cascaded batteries of multiple wireless devices **together** power one of the wireless devices. You discloses a battery charger 1 that can be plugged into a wireless device, but also does not disclose two wireless devices with cascaded batteries. In fact, You does not even disclose two wireless devices. Since the Hong patent and the You patent both disclose **single** wireless devices, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of the Hong and You patents could not possibly have suggested the claimed cascading of batteries in **multiple** wireless devices.

Claim 1 specifically recites that “*the battery device of the **first** wireless mobile device is cascaded with the battery device of the **second** wireless mobile device.*” On the other hand, Hong discloses a **single** wireless device with a **single** battery, while You discloses a **single** wireless communication device with a **single** battery charger, as illustrated in the following table:

Claimed	Hong	You
Weak batteries in two wireless devices are connected together (cascaded) to power one of the devices.	Single battery powers one wireless device —no multiple devices —no cascading—no use of weak batteries in two devices to power one of the devices	Battery charger charges batteries, one wireless device at a time--multiple devices—no cascading—no use of weak batteries in two devices to power one of the devices

Since neither reference teaches connecting two weak batteries in two wireless devices together to power one of the devices (*“said first battery device and said second battery device being connected together for supplying power to the load device of the first wireless mobile device”*), neither the Hong nor the You patent could possibly have suggested the claimed invention, in the absence of hindsight.

According to Hong, battery 200 of phone 100 powers device 300. Unlike the claimed invention, when battery 200 is low, then neither device can be used. The claimed invention avoids this problem by **cascading** the batteries of multiple wireless devices, *i.e.*, **connecting the batteries in series** as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2, so that one of the devices can be operated even when the battery in first device is weak. The Hong publication does not even consider the problem of operating device 300 (or phone 100) when the battery 200 in phone 100 is exhausted.

The You patent, on the other hand, provides a solution to the problem of a weak battery in the device of Hong. *However, the solution is not that provided by the claimed invention—instead, the solution taught by Hong is to provide a battery charger to charge the wireless device.* Providing a separate battery charger is not the same as cascading batteries in two wireless devices, as claimed. The battery charger of Hong is not a wireless communications device, and the battery included in the Hong charger **cannot** be weak to perform its function. When the charger of You is being used to charge the battery of the wireless device, the batteries are **not** cascaded together in the manner claimed, so that combined strength of the batteries powers the device when either of the individual batteries is too weak to do so.

With respect to claim 2, it is respectfully noted that since the battery 200 of phone 100 illustrated in Fig. 6 of Hong powers both phone 100 and device 300, adding more devices will only increase the load on battery 200. This is exactly **contrary** to the cascaded arrangement recited in claim 2, in which all of the cascaded device contribute to the supply of power, and therefore decrease the load on any one battery while increasing the chance that enough power will be available to power one of the devices during an emergency. Furthermore, there is absolutely no suggestion in the You patent that the charger can charge (much less assist in powering) multiple wireless devices.

Because the Hong and You publications fail to disclose or suggest the claimed cascaded battery arrangement, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,501,246 (You) and 6,643,527 (Sato)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Sato patent, like the Hong publication and the You patent, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded power-sharing battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which voltage stabilization is applied to the cascaded batteries are recited in claim 3.

The Sato patent is directed to a power switching unit for a mobile phone that ensures a proper voltage supply, but does not include any arrangement for sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, Sato could not have suggested modification of the phones of Hong and/or You to include such an arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,501,246 (You), 6,643,527 (Satoh), and 3,749,946 (Von Ruti)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Von Ruti patent, like the Satoh and You patents and the Hong publication, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded power-sharing battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which a zener diode is used to provide voltage stabilization for the cascaded batteries as recited in claim 4.

The Von Ruti patent is directed to a microphone amplifier and has nothing to with sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, neither Satoh nor Von Ruti could possibly have suggested modification of the phones of Hong and/or You to include such a cascaded power-sharing arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128050 (Hong) and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,501,246 (You) and 5,177,426 (Nakanishi)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Nakanishi patent, like the Hong publication and the You patent, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, the cascaded battery arrangement of the claimed invention, much less one in which a switch between the battery and load of a first device is opened upon connection of a second device to ensure that batteries in the first and second devices are cascaded rather than connected in parallel as recited in claim 5.

The Nakanishi patent is directed to an over-discharge protection circuit for a mobile phone, and does not include any arrangement for sharing power between multiple mobile phones. As a result, Nakanishi could not have suggested modification of the phones of Hong and/or You to include such an arrangement, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial Number 10/075,297

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bj' followed by a stylized flourish.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: March 16, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\hes\Pending 1...PLUJIN 075297u02.wpd